

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: **IJAR-55311**

TITLE: Education as Transformation: Beyond Rankings, Metrics and Market Logic

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

Accept after minor revision.....

✓ Accept after major revision

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality				✓
Clarity			✓	
Significance			✓	

Reviewer Name: **Dr. Touseef Malik**

Reviewer's Comment for Publication:

The manuscript presents a timely normative critique of rankings- and metrics-driven higher education, arguing for education as an ethical and humanistic transformation. However, the argument is largely essayistic and would benefit from clearer conceptual definitions, engagement with relevant scholarship, and concrete evidence or cases to substantiate key claims.

Recommendation: Accept after Major Revision

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Strengths

1. Clear, consistent with what education should prioritize: humanistic and ethical transformation, with rankings/metrics treated as potential distortions.
2. Accessible, persuasive tone that makes the critique legible to non-specialists (administrators, faculty, general readers).
3. Connects macro-level critique to internal institutional dynamics (voice, power, incentives), improving practical relevance.
4. Moves beyond critique by proposing constructive counter-directions (participatory governance, mentorship, reflective/ethics-oriented curriculum design, technology/data as supportive rather than defining).

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

5. Positions the problem as one of balance (accountability and performance alongside moral and human development), reducing the risk of being read as anti-accountability.

Weaknesses

1. Limited evidentiary support: claims are mostly asserted rather than demonstrated with scholarship, data, or concrete institutional cases.
2. Overgeneralization: broad statements about “most institutions” are not bounded by context (system, region, institution type), which weakens precision.
3. Key concepts are underdefined (e.g., “transformation,” “human values,” “market logic”), reducing analytical clarity and testability.
4. Counterarguments are not fully developed, particularly why metrics proliferate (funding constraints, accountability demands) and what viable alternatives look like under those constraints.
5. Recommendations remain high-level; the paper would be stronger with specific mechanisms (governance changes, evaluation rubrics, example policies) and how success would be assessed.